

The November 30, 2000 Office Action also objected to the specification. In particular, on page 5, in line 12, "clammer" should be --clamp--, and the title was not descriptive. In response, on page 5, in line 12, "clammer" is amended to --clamp-- and the title is amended to --Wire to Electrode Connecting Device--.

The November 30, 2000 Office Action also rejected claims 7-9 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Patent Office found that the sleeve and shut-off member were not described in the specification. As those claims are cancelled, the 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph rejections are moot. However, a shut-off member is clearly shown in each figure and is discussed in the specification. The Examiner's attention is directed to lines 1-4 of page 4. From that description it is readily apparent that the "shut-off member" is used to clamp the wire such that solder cannot advance along the conductive core.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9, and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Maejima. As those claims are cancelled the 35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejections are rendered moot.

The Patent Office rejected claims 3, 5, 6, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maejima in view of admitted prior art (APA). With all respect to the Examiner, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 5 is traversed.

The Patent Office asserts that the Maejima shows all features (of claim 5) except for electrodes connected to a lamp, but that the APA shows that feature. Further, the Patent Office asserts that the instant invention does not provide any reasons for having a portion of

the terminal (clamp) connected to the electrode being perpendicular to the rest of the terminal.

However, Figures 1 and 2 provide a reason for having the terminal being perpendicular, that being to connect a wire running in one direction to an electrode of a lamp that extends in a perpendicular direction. Furthermore, claim 5 includes a limitation of a snap-fit portion that is not in the APA or in Maejima. Thus, claim 5 is allowable.

Additionally, new claims 18-31 are added. Claims 18-27 include a limitation of an “angled” portion that includes snap-fit arms. Claims 28-31 include a limitation of an opening that is dimensioned to receive an electrode. Those limitations are not found or suggested in the relied upon prior art.

Therefore, since none of the relied upon references, alone or together, teach or suggest the inventions defined by claims 5 and newly added claims 18-31, those claims are allowable.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the subject application is in condition for allowance. An early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 624-1285 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete

Page 8

the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

LONG, ALDRIDGE & NORMAN

Date: February 13, 2001

By: John M. Kelly
John M. Kelly
Registration No: 33,920

701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 624-1200
68846.1